

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 13-15, 21-23 and 25-28 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1, 9 and 21 have been amended, while claims 4, 12 and 24 have been cancelled. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below.

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his time and consideration during the phone conversation of 12 February 2009. Amendments contained herein partially reflect the substance of that conversation.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12-15, and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Roberge et al (U.S. 6,381,611), hereinafter "Roberge," in view of Peters et al. (U.S. 5,715,449), hereinafter "Peters."

Claim 1 reads in part, "...the first level root node, the navigation indicia, and the selected second level child node are displayed in a single horizontal line to preserve space in at least a vertical direction in the first window..." (Claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 9 and 21). Applicants respectfully submit that both Roberge and Peters, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features of claim 1. Specifically, Peters fails to disclose "...display[ed] in a single horizontal line to preserve space in at least a vertical direction..." (Claim 1). Peters, at Figure 4, shows a display whereby second level nodes are displayed on distinct horizontal lines in the window. (See Peters at FIG.

4, e.g., “property/location” and “location/abdomen”). As such, the display of Peters fails to “preserve space in at least a vertical direction.” Further, Roberge fails to disclose the “single horizontal line” of claim 1. In fact, the display of Roberge occupies greater space in a vertical direction than the display of Peters. (Roberge at FIGS. 7-9).

Therefore, Roberge fails to overcome the deficiencies of Peters.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable. Further, Applicants submit that independent claims 9 and 21 are allowable for reasons similar to those set forth with regard to independent claim 1.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicants hereby incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner’s interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner’s analysis, combinations, and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Examiner’s combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Matthew B. Pinckney /

Dated: 12 February 2009

Matthew B. Pinckney
Reg. No. 62,727

Hoffman Warnick, LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile